

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. Clerical corrections have been made to claims 1 and 5. Claim 8 has also been amended.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claim 8 as allegedly having insufficient antecedent basis for the “said door” language in that claim. Applicant has amended claim 8 to include the word “elevator” in front of the word “door” to avoid any possible ambiguity. The rejection should be withdrawn.

All rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

Every rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 requires modifying the *Kato, et al.* reference in a manner that is not permissible. MPEP 2143.01(V) and (VI) explain that a proposed modification to a reference cannot be made where it will change the principle of operation of that reference or make it incapable of performing its intended function. The Examiner’s proposed changes to the *Kato, et al.* reference do exactly that and, therefore, cannot be made. It follows that there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The *Kato, et al.* reference relies upon actuation of the door mover mechanism (5, 6, 7, 8) for purposes of moving the auxiliary sill 14. The Examiner proposes to modify the *Kato, et al.* reference to cause the auxiliary sill 14 to be moved into a position where it could be locked to a landing structure before the elevator door of the *Kato, et al.* reference is opened. That kind of modification would completely change the principle of operation of the *Kato, et al.* reference and render it incapable of achieving its intended result. The principle of operation in that reference is to use movement of the door opening mechanism to cause movement of the auxiliary sill 14 from the position shown in Figure 2 into the position shown in Figure 4. The position shown in Figure

2 corresponds to the door being in the closed position of Figure 1 and the position of Figure 4 corresponds to the open position of Figure 3. It is movement of the door from the closed position of Figure 1 to the open position of Figure 3 that results in the movement of the auxiliary sill 14 from the position in Figure 2 to the position of Figure 4. With the proposed modification, that type of coordinated movement is no longer possible. Therefore, it changes the principle of operation of the reference.

Additionally, the *Kato, et al.* reference relies upon movement of the door opening mechanism to achieve its intended result of moving the auxiliary sill 14. If one were to modify the reference according to the Examiner's suggestion, it would be impossible to do that because the modification would require moving the auxiliary sill 14 by some other mechanism because the door opening mechanism cannot move according to the modification until the auxiliary sill 14 is in the position shown in Figure 4.

It is impossible to manufacture a *prima facie* case of obviousness by attempting to modify the *Kato, et al.* reference in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Given that the proposed modification cannot be made in any one of the Examiner's stated grounds of rejection, all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 must be withdrawn.

This case is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

By: 

David J. Gaskey
Registration No. 37,139
400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: February 24, 2009